



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Rome put Noah's ark and Jacob's ladder into her prayers to the Immaculate Conception, instead of **TRANSFERRING** to the Conception of **Mary** what the Holy Spirit spake of the origin of the "Wisdom uncreated," the everlasting Son of God?

And, after all, the Pope goes on to say—"Wherefore, from the ancient times, the princes of the Church, ecclesiastics, and even emperors and kings themselves, have earnestly entreated of this apostolic see that the Immaculate Conception of the most holy mother of God should be defined as a *dogma of Catholic faith*;" and again—"We resolved that we should no longer delay to *sanction* and *define*, by our supreme authority, the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin." And, in the name of goodness, if, as the Pope says, it was "revealed by God," and always held and believed in the Church, how comes it that it never till now was "a dogma of Catholic faith?"

One word more to show the practical object of this Papal decree. The Pope thus issues his command—"Let all the children of the Catholic Church, most dear to us, hear these our words; and, with a more ardent zeal of piety, religion, and love, proceed to **WORSHIP**, invoke, AND PRAY to the most blessed Virgin Mary, mother of God, conceived without original sin."

It has been usual, when Protestants have said that the Church of Rome teaches men "to worship" and "pray to" the Virgin, to hear this indignantly denied. But now it is absolutely **COMMANDED**, by what professes to be the infallible authority of the Church of Rome.

Let those look to it who have hitherto denied that their Church teaches this idolatry; and let them hear the warning voice that comes from heaven—"Go out from her, my people, that you be not partakers of her sins."—Apocalypse xviii. 4, Douay Bible.

The Pope concludes his decree with a threat, which becomes the less terrible the more it is considered. "Let no man interfere with this our declaration, pronunciation, and definition, or oppose and contradict it with presumptuous rashness. If any should presume to assail it, let him know that he will incur the *indignation of the omnipotent God*, and of his blessed Apostles Peter and Paul." As if the Pope had in his hand the indignation of Almighty God and the apostles to bestow it upon whom he would!

How would Popes John X., John XI., John XII., Pope Lando, and many others, have bestowed that indignation? Not surely upon adulterers or robbers!

We trust that God Almighty still keeps his indignation in his own power, to be exercised on those alone "who love not the Gospel, and obey not the Lord Jesus Christ."

But where did Popes get this power, or from whom did they learn these mighty threats? That shall be told. Pope Nicholas I., the man who imposed the forged *decretal epistles* of the Popes upon the Church, in the ninth century, that was the man who *first* took into his own hands "the indignation of Almighty God and the chief of the Apostles."† And if our readers will look back to our number for February, 1854, p. 16, col. 3, under the heading, "Popes' Power of *Condemning to Hell*," they will find Pope Nicholas's authority for assuming a power until that time unknown in the Church. And from that time forward Popes have enforced their decrees by such threats as Pope Pius now uses—on the authority of forgery alone!

We commend it to our readers to consider whether this present decree of the Pope is to be

* The Latin is, "Colere, invocare, exorare beatissimam. Dei genitricem, &c." The translation is the *Tablet's*, not yours.

† See our article in this number, p. 15.

‡ Ep. xxx. ad Carolum Calvum Regem.—Labbe and Cosart, vol. viii., 110. Ed. Paris, 1671.

received as the decision of an infallible authority instituted by God in His Church—whether the act by which the Virgin Mary was conceived in the womb of her mother is to be henceforward "the true object of devotion" to the Catholic Church—whether the Virgin herself is to be "worshipped" and "prayed to" by Catholics.

RECENT CONTROVERSY AT BOULOGNE.

(Continued from page 10.)

You cite the case of the Asiatic Churches as celebrating Easter contrary to the Roman custom, and say that Victor, Bishop of Rome, excommunicated them. This proves him to have been, as he was then held to be, a hot, impious, and meddling man. But why did you not assert the only thing pertinent to your case—namely, that these Churches of Asia recognised his authority and yielded? Simply, because instead of submitting, they *disclaimed* it, and continued to observe their own day of celebrating Easter, notwithstanding his attempted interference.

This case will show how carelessly assertions are made in support of Roman Catholic claims. It is perfectly notorious that the Eastern Churches refused to adopt the custom of the west, and followed their own mode of Paschal observance for more than a century and a quarter after Victor's unauthorized interference. The Council of Nice decided the time of celebration. On this Pontiff's attempt he was abominated by several bishops, amongst the rest by Ireneus. Eusebius states that Victor's attempt was displeasing to many who spoke strongly to him. Ireneus uses very decided language. He says, the Apostles commanded not to judge others in matters of meat or drink, and, very pertinently to the point, *ἐν πεπειρέστης* (in the matter of a festival). The fragment of this letter which is preserved, as well as the history of this whole controversy, is decisive testimony against the authority of the Roman See. It is perfectly certain that the attempt of the Pontiff to interfere with the liberties of the Asiatic Churches was, in this, as in other cases, summarily disallowed. The eastern mode of celebrating Easter was persevered in until the Council of Nice, notwithstanding Victor's disapproval.*

You next adduce the instance of Cyprian, and assert that when a council of sixty-six African bishops decided that the children of heretics should be rebaptized, the Roman Pontiff Stephen threatened them with excommunication, and that Cyprian, "great man as he was," was obliged to bend.

Now, the facts of the case are *directly the reverse*. The African bishops, with Cyprian at their head, were so far from bending before Stephen, that they re-affirmed, in most emphatic terms, their former decision, notwithstanding his *condemnation of it*. Two Carthaginian Councils had already pronounced a doctrine differing from that of Rome. The second of these, by a synodical letter, informed the Pontiff of its decision. Stephen haughtily disapproved. Strong letters passed between him and Cyprian. The Roman bishop broke off all communication with these opposing Africans. But so far were they from being intimidated therat, and yielding, that in a third Council of Carthage (256) they repeated their former judgment. Peace ensued on Stephen's death. But the Africans *maintained their own doctrine*; and, so far down as the fourth century, the opinion of the Greek Fathers was in accordance with that of those Carthaginian Councils.†

[Repetition of assertion naturally tends to secure its acceptance. The Church of Rome makes powerful use of the fact to the furtherance (and to the discredit) of its cause. The amount to which historic truth has been perverted by its advocates is most lamentable and wicked. A good cause rejects such defences, but the exigencies of inveterate error force it to expedients which are its refutation and its shame. We speak of those who, knowing the fraud, or having reason to suspect it, persevere in using or in countenancing it. The present instance is one to the point. Father Lacordaire (whose works, according to my opponents, have received the sanction of the Catholic Church), with others, asserts that Cyprian yielded in this matter to Pope Stephen. The simple account of the transaction, the continuance of the Eastern view until long after Stephen, sufficiently refute the statement. Nothing can be clearer than that the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff was not for a moment admitted—nay, that it was peremptorily rejected. And, as to his infallibility, let Cyprian testify to his view of it. He says—"In tunc Stephani fratris nostri obstinatio dura prorupit, ut etiam de Marcionis baptismo, item Valentini, et Apelletis, et ceterorum blasphemantium in Deum patrem contendat

* The Paschal controversy contains ample evidence against the usurpations of the Romish See, and is a most unfortunate case for its advocates to adduce. They bring it forward solely because it shows some cases of interference on the part of the Pontiff; but they suppress the fact that such interference was rejected. It is well-known matter of history that the ancient British and Irish Churches, observing their own mode of celebrating Easter, refused conformance to the Roman method, and persevered in their opposition, and proved their independence, notwithstanding the attempts of the See of Rome upon their liberties. Baronius confesses that the early Irish Church was treated by the Church of Rome as schismatical up to the sixth century.

† And (as it is highly pertinent to observe) an intermediate opinion, which afterwards became the prevailing one, arose in the Western Church itself.

filios deo nasci." Here the African Father speaks of the "unbending obstinacy" of the Pontiff; charges him with holding those to be regenerate who speak evil (blasphemy) against God the Father; he describes the same Pontiff as having written rashly, and without forethought, things haughty, irrelevant, and contradictory. And when Stephen urges Roman tradition, the steadfast African rejects it in terms, which (notwithstanding Cyprian's hierarchical notions) are especially adverse to the Romish cause. His words are—"How great is that obstinacy, how great that presumption, which prefers human tradition to divine injunction, and perceives not that God is indignant as often as human tradition sets at nought and neglects the divine commands. Custom which has crept in among *some unawares* (a home thrust) ought not to hinder truth from prevailing and triumphing; for (the aphorism is well worth recording) custom without truth is only error in veteate." He then finely adds—"It is no more beneath the dignity of a Roman bishop than of any other man to suffer himself to be corrected when he is in the wrong; for the bishop ought not only to teach but to learn; for he becomes even the better teacher, who is daily adding to his knowledge and making progress by the correction of his errors."

Such is the witness of Cyprian to pontifical infallibility and jurisdiction over the whole Church of Christ. But in order to show how utterly untrue it is to affirm of Cyprian and the African Church that they yielded to Stephen (whom they so resolutely and successfully opposed) in this matter of baptism, we shall mention some contemporary events.

Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, upon learning the opposition made to the Roman Pontiff by Cyprian and the African Church, wrote, assuring them of the full approbation of the Churches of his province. Dionysius, of Alexandria, likewise condemned the conduct of the Pontiff. The letter of the former, extant in 26 Cod., is so strikingly adverse to Romish pretensions, that it was purposely omitted in the Ed. of Cyp., Rom. ap. Paul Manutium, 1563.

Firmilian speaks of Stephen's "boldness and insolence," of his "open and manifest folly," of the strife and dissensions which he had caused in the Churches. And, then, in reference to his attempted excommunication of the African Church, apostrophising the Pope, uses the following language:—"Thou hast cut off thyself. Be not deceived. He is truly the schismatic who has made himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity." Pretty strong terms these in which to speak of the Pope, and fully sufficient to show how entirely unknown in those days had been the modern claims of Papal infallibility and jurisdiction.

In order to leave no doubt that the assertion of Cyprian's deference to the Roman Pontiff in this matter is wholly at variance with truth, let us take the testimony of the celebrated Roman Catholic historian, Dupin. Having given the same account of the controversy between Stephen and Cyprian which I have given, and spoken strongly of the unchristian conduct of the Pontiff, he says—"It is certain that St. Cyprian never altered his opinion; that the Greek Churches were, for a long time after him, divided upon this question; that the Council of Arles first decided it in the west, &c."

The next argument from Cyprian is founded upon the words—"Primacy was given to Peter to show that there is but one Church, and one Chair—does he who abandons the Chair of Peter, upon which the Church is founded, flatter himself that he is in the Church?"

Whatever meaning we may give to these words, *supposing them to be genuine*, it is certain you cannot deduce from them that Cyprian believed in the infallibility or supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, because he had, as we have seen, in conjunction with the Council of Carthage, determinedly and successfully opposed him. Cyprian held high views of the Church order and unity. He supposed bishops to be successors of the Apostles. Of the last he says—"They were all, in common with Peter, possessed of like power and authority." His words here are express. Bishops, their successors, were, in like manner, all equal. "Christ," he says, "to mark the unity of his Church, mentions one among these equals by name, Peter." It was to mark or indicate unity, but not to *localize* it at Rome, that, in Cyprian's view, Christ made mention of *one*—i.e., Peter. Unity did not consist in the subordination of all Churches to one visible head, resident at Rome, but in the communion of each Church with all the others. He was as truly a schismatic who separated from the See of Carthage as he who broke communion with Rome. Cyprian's idea of unity was what Firmilian expressed when, in writing to him, he describes—in reference to Pope Stephen—the true schismatic to be the one who, by breaking the general union among Churches, separated himself from "the communion of ecclesiastical (not pontifical) unity."

[So far as this passage is concerned, we need not dwell upon it further than to notice it as another instance of the imposition practised on the too confiding members of the Church of Rome. The former statement contradicted history, and was untrue in point of fact. This statement is a fraud, for it is an interpolation on the works of Cyprian. The genuine passage is as follows (I mark, by brackets, the Romish interpolations):—"Et quamvis apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam patrem potestatem tribuat, et dicat, 'Sicut misit me pater,' &c., tamen ut unitatem manifestaret [unam cathedralm constituit et] unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate dis-

posuit. Hoc erant utique et ceteri apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consilio prædicti et honoris et potestatis; sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur [et primatus Petro datur at una Christi ecclesia et cathedra una monstratur. Et pastores sunt omnes, et grex unus ostenditur, qui ab apostolis omnibus unanimitate consensione pascatur] ut ecclesia Christi una monstratur. Hanc ecclesiam unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidum credit? Qui ecclesia renititur et resistit [qui cathedralm Petri, super quem fundata est ecclesia deserit], in ecclesia se esse confidit."

It will hence appear that the passage quoted by my opponents *consists of interpolations*. Gieseler asserts they are not to be found in the oldest MSS. Now, these *insertions* are the parts on which the Romish claim is based, so far as this passage is concerned. The genuine words show Cyprian's view "of unity" to be as I have represented it. To these sad expedients is the Church of Rome driven in support of her claims. They are the sure but distressing evidences of their conscious untenability.]

The 3rd passage which you have quoted from Cyprian, ends with the words—"to whom perfidiness cannot have access." The inference which you made hence is this—that, according to the testimony of this writer, the Church of Rome was infallible.

[This is, perhaps, a suitable place for observing, that I had, during this discussion, repeatedly asked for, but could not obtain, references to the extracts and editions of the writers quoted by my opponents. I subsequently both wrote and sent to obtain them, but to no purpose. The reason was, perhaps, this, that the quotations were, I believe, almost wholly made second hand. With respect to the present passage, I had at first understood Mr. Gretton to quote it in reference to Pope Stephen; and, knowing what Cyprian's view of this prelate's conduct was, I requested him to read on, believing that something important was suppressed. I had no books of reference with me during this discussion, and could only rely on my memory. But, having previously noticed an attempt of Cardinal Wiseman's, in his Lectures on the Church, to mislead the public with regard to the opinions of Cyprian, by affirming a doctrine to be his, which he certainly did not hold, and which neither he nor his times had even heard of, I quoted a passage from Cyprian's letter, directly asserting that Pope Stephen was deceived, and, therefore, not infallible. It turned out, however, that Mr. Gretton had quoted from a letter of Cyprian's to Pope Cornelius. The passage is, so far as I know, quite genuine; but the inference made from it completely contradicts Cyprian's own explicit assertion. He never held the Roman See to be preserved by divine Providence from the possibility of being deceived, because he expressly asserts the reverse, in the case of Pope Stephen; and as for his jurisdiction, Cyprian and the North African Church resisted it without hesitation.

Now, with respect to the epistle to Cornelius, if any one will take the trouble of looking at it, he will see that Cyprian as little held the infallibility and jurisdiction of this Pontiff as of the other. The letter is, in part, an *expostulation* with Cornelius for receiving as ambassador of the Carthaginian Bishop, Fortunatus, a person (Felicitissimus) who had been excommunicated. He exhorts the Pope to be firm, and not to fear the threats of wicked men; he very clearly intimates that the Pontiff had no right to interfere in the matter. "The cause had been already decided, and judgment already passed where the crime had been committed. The opinions of bishops should not be different. Christ says, let your discourse be yea, yea." The Roman Pontiff was not to alter the judgment already passed by another Church. Hence, it is very certain that Cyprian held not the infallibility, or admitted the supreme jurisdiction of Pope Cornelius. The passage, "to whom perfidiness cannot have access," plainly means this—that the Church, whose faith was praised by Paul, should be so mindful of its high character, as, by its foresight and wisdom, to preclude the hope of evil men to deceive by perfidy. That Cyprian did not mean to say more, or, that in point of fact, the Roman See was so secured, is plain; for he expressly says, that perfidy *did* get access, and *did* prevail.]

The last argument you allege from Cyprian is, that "he calls the Church of Rome the root and matrix of the Catholic Church." In any literal sense this is plainly untrue, since other apostolic Churches were founded, so far as we know, before the Church of Rome. The term on which you base your argument was commonly applied to apostolic Churches. And the second Council of Constantinople justly styles the Church of Jerusalem as "the mother of all the Churches in the World."

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

ON THE INFALLIBLE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I am able to adduce many more passages from the Holy and Divine Book in support of the infallibility of the Church, but, as you are so fond of brevity, I will only give a few of them in this letter.

On the eve of our Lord's passion, in order to wean His afflicted Apostles from the sensible delights of His presence, of which they were, in a short time, to be deprived, He places before their view the speedy arrival of another

Comforter, and the glorious prerogatives of that pillar of truth, of which they were to be the first supporters. "I will ask the Father," said He, "and he will give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive."—John xiv. 16, and a portion of verse 17. He then subjoins (v. 26) the nature and end of this divine mission—"The Comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you." In the continuation of His address (xvi. 13) the same promise is repeated—"But when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will teach you all truth."

It is almost trifling with common sense to set about reasoning on these evident testimonies. Christ promises the descent of a Comforter; the promise was fulfilled on Whit-Sunday. He further promises that this Divine Spirit of Truth should abide with them for ever, should teach them all things, and lead them into all truth. Who shall dare to doubt but that this second part of the promise has also been fulfilled in every age since the days of the Apostles? What was the end or nature for which the promise was delivered? To guide the Apostles and their successors for ever into all truth. For has not the Church, in every age, required the perpetual assistance of the Director of Truth, as well as in the Apostolic times? And if it were necessary for them who had imbibed the true faith from the mouth, and in the school of Jesus himself, how much more so must it not be for the faithful in every succeeding age? Therefore, it is clear that the unlimited and unconditional promise of Christ could never become void, whilst the only cause for which it was made still existed in all its force; and hence He has promised that the Spirit of Truth should for ever remain with the Church, conducting her into all truth. That this was His meaning will be further proved from the next Scriptural argument in support of her infallibility, which you shall have next month.

I remain, sir, your humble servant,

WILLIAM ROURKE.

Before any argument can be founded, for the infallibility of the present Church, on the passage from St. John quoted by Mr. Rourke, it is necessary to prove that it is addressed, not to the Apostles merely, but to the Church of every age. Now, let us look at the context. We find our Lord saying—"These things I have spoken unto you, being present with you."—xiv. 25. "The Comforter shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have told you."—xiv. 26. "I go away, and come again to you."—xiv. 29. "I have told you before it came to pass."—xiv. 28. "You have been with me from the beginning."—xv. 27. "These things I have told you, that when the time shall come you may remember that I told you of them. And these things I said not unto you at the beginning, because I was with you."—xvi. 4. "I have many things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now."—xvi. 12. Is it not evident from all these passages that our Lord was addressing the Apostles themselves, and, in order to comfort them for his approaching departure, promising them the assistance of a Paraclete, whose stay with them should not be temporary, like the sojourn of our Lord on earth, but who should abide with them always? Through the whole passage there is not a syllable said about the successors of the Apostles. If our Lord had meant them, would he not have said so, and, at the same time, told us who they were?

The passage cited by Mr. Rourke, when not cut away from the context, affords an argument *against* the claims of the Church of Rome. Let Mr. Rourke open the passage in his Bible, and he will read as follows:—"If ye love me, keep my commandments, and I will ask my Father, and he shall give ye another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive." When the passage is read thus entire, it shows clearly that Roman Catholics can have no certainty of the decisions of their Church. They cannot conclude, in virtue of this promise, that the Pope is infallible when he declares the doctrines of their Church, unless they can be certain that he fulfills the condition of the promise—namely, to love God, and keep his commandments. Now, Mr. Rourke will not deny that many occupants of the Roman See were men of the world—worldly, wicked, carnal, diabolical men—men who, it is expressly stated here, "cannot receive the spirit of truth." From this very text, then, we conclude that the Church of Rome can have no certainty of the truth of the decrees of such Popes, or of the decisions of councils which have been confirmed by them, and, therefore, the infallibility of the Church which guides herself by such decrees, falls to the ground.

FOURTH COUNCIL OF LATERAN, AND PERSECUTION OF HERETICS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—In the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, for February, 1853, you stated that the Lateran Council decreed that temporal princes should be compelled by the Pope to exterminate heretics from their dominions. I would feel deeply indebted if you would kindly answer such objections to the above as you may have heard stated, such as the denial of Dr. Doyle that it was a decree of

a general council (see examination before House of Lords, April 21, 1825), and the assertion, or rather insinuation, of Milner ("End of Controversy," page 124), that it was only directed against persons who, on account of their crimes, deserved such treatment.

There are several friends of mine who would, I imagine, be led to doubt the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church if doctrines so contrary to those which Christianity teaches were clearly shown to have been decided upon by an Ecumenical Council.

I would also wish to direct your attention to the statements made by Dr. Dixon, relating to the Apocrypha; they appear to me to be exceedingly absurd; and I consider it would be well if you would devote some of the space in your journal to answering them, as they are put forward by a person of such a high station in the Roman Catholic Church.

Trusting that you will persevere in the good work in which you are engaged,

I remain, Sir,
Yours, sincerely,
A PROTESTANT.

3rd February, 1855.

We thank our correspondent for calling our attention to a very important subject, on which we will endeavour to satisfy him.

We admit that Roman Catholics are excusable, in some cases, for being puzzled to know what are, and what are not, general councils.

Roman Catholics are bound, indeed, by the creed of Pope Pius IV., to believe, as matters of faith, and necessary to salvation, all that the general councils have defined; but their Church has not given them any authorized list of general councils, nor any means of knowing *how many* general councils there are. On this subject we refer to an article in our number for October, 1853, vol. ii., p. 116.

At the same time, there are *some* councils which the Church of Rome *has* declared to be general councils, which no one may venture to deny. The Council of Trent is an instance of this, and so is the Fourth Council of Lateran, which decreed the extermination of heretics. And it has often struck us with astonishment to see the coolness with which some Roman controversialists will deny those very authorities which, by the creed of Pope Pius IV., they are bound to believe, whenever the arguments of Protestants become so strong as to make them ashamed of confessing those authorities before the world.

We will now proceed to show what claims the Fourth Council of Lateran has to be acknowledged as a general council of the Church of Rome; and if any should then say they are not bound to receive its decrees, we ask them to consider what greater obligation they have to believe in the infallibility of the Pope's late decree on the Immaculate Conception.

The Fourth Council of Lateran was summoned by a circular letter of Pope Innocent III. In Labbe and Cossart, vol. xi., 123, we have a copy of the letter sent to the archbishop and bishops of the Province of Vienna. In that letter the Pope says—"Because these things concern the common state of all the faithful, we *convoke* A GENERAL COUNCIL according to the ancient custom of the holy Fathers." The letter goes on to state the purposes for which this general council is called—"For extirpating vices and planting virtues, correcting excesses and reforming manners, for *rooting out heresies* and confirming the faith," &c., &c. And, for full preparation, *two years* notice is given, because "a universal council" could not conveniently be gathered quicker. And the Pope thus speaks of the source whence this council originates—"Believing that this salutary proposal descends from Him by whom every best and every perfect gift is given;" referring to the Epistle of St. James, ch. i., v. 17.

Then follows a list of those to whom copies of this letter were sent, by which, it appears, that SEVENTY-SIX copies of this letter were sent out, each one directed to the archbishop and bishops of a province.]

Then follows a letter to the Greek Emperor, calling on him to send special ambassadors to the council (col. 126), and a list of twelve other kings of Europe to whom similar letters were sent. Then follow letters to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, also summoning them to a "general council" (col. 128, 130).

So this was clearly a summons for a general council of the Church of Rome.

And the attendance was answerable to the summons. No less than four hundred and twelve bishops, besides eight hundred abbots and priors attended. And Pope Innocent himself presided at the council.

Now, we ask any Roman Catholic to tell us what was wanting here to constitute a general council of the Church of Rome.

Can any one show us a list of general councils in any Roman Catholic author, in which this Fourth Lateran

* Ut quia hæc universorum fidelium communem statum respiciunt, generalis concilium iuxta priscam sanctorum patrum consuetudinem convocamus.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. xi., 124.

† Ad extirpandas vitia, et plantandas virtutes, corrigendas excessus, et reformandas mores, eliminandas hereses, ad roborandam fidem, &c.—Vol. ix., 124.

‡ Quia vero ante biennium, universale non posset concilium com-mode congregari.

§ Credentes igitur hoc salutare propositionem ab illo descendere, a quo est omne datum optimum, et omne donum perfectum.

¶ This whole list is given in Labbe and Cossart, vol. xi., 125, 126.